PREFACE

AT LONG LAST, the second volume of this work sees the light! Inasmuch as they are not instructive to the public, I will willingly pass over in silence the reasons that have caused its excessive delay. I can only provide assurance that the volume has certainly benefited, as I have thereby had all the opportunity to make it more complete, correct many defects, and better adapt it to the object for which it is principally destined. What this object is, what means I have undertaken to fulfill it, and what benefits may be expected from this second volume—this is what I propose to elucidate in this Preface, made necessary by the very nature of the subjects that I treat here, which are, in fact, entirely different from those in the first volume.

This volume, like the first, is divided into two parts. The first, which constitutes Part III of the entire work, consists wholly of musical scholarship that can most justly claim to stimulate the laudable curiosity of every student of music. Is it not agreeable for one to know the principal occurrences in the history of the art that he professes and the most extraordinary scholarship that pertains to them? Is it not reasonably satisfying to one to know the origin of the barbarous words *Alamire, Bmi, Csolfaut*, etc., the origin of the clefs and their figures? Why the chromatic diesis happens to be formed of four little lines, while the enharmonic is indicated with only two? Why the letter b happens to be preferred, to the exclusion of all others, to indicate the flat and the natural, and other similar curiosities worthy of anyone who is rational and seeks to be schooled in his own art? These are precisely the things that I have sought to elucidate with the greatest clarity and brevity in this third part by bringing them out of the darkness in which they lay among the writers (very learned for the most part) of the past centuries.

The first article gives an idea of the history of the first peoples of the earth. We cannot sufficiently satisfy our curiosity about this subject, finding no other

insights than the Sacred Bible and what little the very erudite Jewish historian Flavius Josephus has said about it in the history of his people. Let he who wishes to know something more about it turn to Father Giambattista Martini's *Storia della musica*, a work that merits being read by every lover of music, and for which it would be desirable that an equally learned pen provide us with its continuation.[3]

The following three articles elucidate how much of greater interest and certainty Greek music offers us. Inasmuch as the Greeks were the inventors of music turned into art, it is most suitable to understand their theories, which still exert a great influence on modern music because they were the first to demonstrate by calculation the proper measure of all of the musical intervals as well as the necessity of forming the *diapason*, or octave, of five tones and two semitones by determining all of their relationships. Moreover, they made various other very ingenious discoveries that prepared the great revolution that music was destined to undergo in the eleventh century by means of Guido.

In Article V, we elucidate the felicitous reform of this learned musician, which then led to the perfection that this science afterwards acquired; and in the two following articles, as much as relates to music of the past two centuries. Since some extraordinary men flourished in this art during those eras, whose most praiseworthy ecclesiastical compositions are very beneficial to understand and to study, and since these have come down to us through wood engraving—usually in individual parts, without division into bars—, it is necessary to turn them into a score in order to understand them properly, affixing the necessary bar lines, time signatures, and modern note shapes. One is not able to do this without exact information about the note shapes, ligatures, time signatures, and dots that were used in those times, all very different from those presently in use and of which we have almost lost track. For the benefit of all, I have attempted to bring them out of the impenetrable obscurity in which they lay among the ancient authors. It is very true that perhaps I will have erred in some places, and especially about the subjects of time signatures and dots, which is more confusing than any other. But how is it possible not to err in the almost perpetual contradiction I have found among even the most classical writers I have undertaken the tedious task of consulting, as I could easily prove

[3][Gal.] The learned Father Martini, perhaps believing himself immortal, issued three volumes of his *Storia* in Bologna with a space of thirteen years between the first and the second and eleven years between the second and the third. Two contemporary editions of it have been issued, one in folio, the other in quarto, which extend through the complete history of the Greek musicians. [Ed.] Giovanni Battista Martini, *Storia della musica*, 3 vols. (Bologna: Lelio dalla Volpe, 1757–81).

by citing many passages from them if I did not fear boring the reader to excess? I confess, however, that I have taken many insights from Rousseau's excellent dictionary of music,[4] a truly unparalleled work and worthy of that rare intellect.

In the last two articles, then, I have sought to clarify the very interesting subject of the modes.[5] In Article X, I treat those of plainsong. This is also an obscure and impenetrable subject, and up to now I have found no one whose elucidations have shed true light on them: they are in the darkest chaos in the writings of Zarlino, Artusi, Doni, Kircher,[6] and up through Martini. In addition to being very fallacious, the rules given by practitioners with the usual

Re La Primus
Re Fa Secundus
Mi Fa Tertius
Mi La Quartus
Fa Fa Quintus
Fa La Sextus
Ut Sol Septimus
Ut Fa Octavus

to indicate the pitch of the final and the first pitch of the *Evovae*[7] can be adapted only to those antiphons, etc., followed by the appropriate *Evovae*, or intonations. Since these are not found everywhere, the rule remains inept and pointless. As to those who teach that the second of these syllables indicates the pitch that is repeated most often during the course of the chant in plainsong, this is a completely naive and ridiculous rule. Of all the methods for recognizing the modes of plainsong, the most dependable is certainly that of the range of the pitches themselves in each mode, elucidated at length in the cited article, a method that one can keep in one's head with facility, immediately stands out to the eye, and is infallible. The last chapter develops the theory of keys in

---

[4][Ed.] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Dictionnaire de musique* (Paris: Veuve Duchesne, 1768).

[5][Ed.] Galeazzi uses the terms *modo* and *tono* interchangeably at times, both to mean either the older modes or the newer keys of major/minor tonality. Here, he uses *tono* with simultaneous reference to both of them.

[6][Ed.] Gioseffo Zarlino, *Le istituzioni harmoniche* (Venice: [Francesco dei Franceschi Senese], 1558); Giovanni Maria Artusi, *L'Artusi overo delle imperfettioni della moderna musica ragionamenti dui* (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1600); Giovanni Battista Doni, *Annotazioni sopra il compendio de'generi e de'modi della musica* (Rome: Andrea Fei, 1640); Athanasius Kircher, *Musurgia universalis sive ars magna consoni et dissoni*, 2 vols. (Rome: Francesco Corbelletti, 1650).

[7][Gal.] This word is composed of the vowels of the words "seculorum amen," which always conclude the psalm intonations.

modern music, a subject of the greatest interest. The reader who yearns to be instructed must not pass by this without having understood it perfectly and without having written many times, by himself, all of the scales that are given in examples 51 and 55. We now come to Part IV.

It will certainly seem strange, after so many distinguished and sublime treatises about counterpoint, that I, too, should boldly want to run such a well-trodden but ever difficult course. It is true that a great many superb books on this science abound; but tell me, if you please, after a beginner—be he player or singer—will have had the patience to read Zarlino, Gaffurio, Doni, Fux, Artusi, Penna, Tevo, Mersenne, Tartini, Rameau,[8] and countless other equally distinguished authors, what will he have ever learned? At the very most, some slight theoretical knowledge, without knowing at all how to adapt it to practice. The majority of these excellent books requires mathematical knowledge that is unfortunately not very familiar to many professors of music. Moreover, it is necessary to already be a master—and also very well instructed in the art—to be able to understand them. It therefore seems that a clear and easy book (insofar as the nature of the very difficult subject allows it) nevertheless remains wanting, within reach of everyone, especially those initiated into music only by means of playing or singing who yearn to learn the science of harmony.

Setting myself to this difficult task, I have attempted to write a book that will be useful and intelligible to any beginner who is not new to the musical landscape. It is up to him to judge whether I will have succeeded with this. As for the masters: let them not read me. I do not write for them; they have no need of my insights. Moreover, I trust that if they, too, want to take the trouble or the tedium to browse these pages without prejudice, perhaps they will not consider they have entirely wasted their time in reading them.

What I methodically explain in order about the system of fundamental bass and about other theoretical subjects will be able to be understood, perhaps even in a first reading, by anyone who may be furnished with mediocre understanding, but the practical part cannot be learned from books. It is absolutely

---

[8][Ed.] Franchino Gaffurio, *Theorica musice* (Milan: Ioannes Petrus de Lomatio, 1492); Johann Joseph Fux, *Gradus ad Parnassum* (Vienna: Joannes Petrus van Ghelen, 1725); Lorenzo Penna, *Li primi albori musicali per li principianti della musica figurata*, 3 vols. (Bologna: Giacomo Monti, 1672); Zaccaria Tevo, *Il musico testore* (Venice: Antonio Bortoli, 1706); Marin Mersenne, *Harmonie universelle, contenant la théorie et la pratique de la musique, où il est traité de la nature des sons, et des mouvemens, des consonances, des dissonances, des genres, des modes, de la composition, de la voix, des chants, et de toutes sortes d'instrumens harmoniques*, 8 parts in 3 vols. (Paris: Sébastien Cramoisy, 1636); Giuseppe Tartini, *Trattato di musica secondo la vera scienza dell'armonia* (Padua: Stamperia del Seminario, appresso Giovanni Manfré, 1754); Jean-Philippe Rameau, *Traité de l'harmonie reduite à ses principes naturels* (Paris: Jean-Baptiste-Christophe Ballard, 1722).

necessary to provide oneself with a good master,[9] and in this case, my book will become very useful for the many things that, to my knowledge, have never yet been published by any writer and will turn out to be of the greatest utility. This will be sufficiently observed from the following enumeration of articles that comprise Part IV, but even more from the work itself.

Since the science of music is divided into the two already mentioned parts of harmony and melody,[10] I have divided this fourth part into two sections, treating harmony in the first and melody in the second. In the first article, I begin with definitions of the art, which must always be stated beforehand in all of the sciences to avoid ambiguity; by having omitted such a precaution, the majority of writers about music have thereby rendered themselves unintelligible. More interesting is Article II: there I elucidate the physical-musical experiments that serve as a foundation for the system of fundamental bass. As the entire science of harmony depends on these and as there is no lack of people—even very learned ones—who have called them into doubt, here the beginner will do well to repeat them carefully himself one by one, as I myself have repeated these experiments a thousand times in the presence of my students, so that he remains fully convinced of their truth. Part of these experiments are from Monsieur Rameau, part from Sig. Giuseppe Tartini of Padua; then, two very interesting ones are my own: the fifth and the sixth, in which it is proven that every pitch causes its lower octave, twelfth, and major seventeenth to resound. Sig. Rameau has truly said that every pitch has the property of causing its upper octave, twelfth, and major seventeenth to resonate in the air, and to cause its lower octave, twelfth, and major seventeenth to vibrate and oscillate without resonating. Monsieur Rousseau, with reason, cannot begin to comprehend[11] how a sounding body could possibly vibrate and oscillate without resonating. Does not sound consist precisely of vibrations and oscillations of the sounding body?

The truth of the matter, however, is that the partials of every sounding body, i.e., its lower octave, twelfth, and major seventeenth, not only vibrate and reverberate, but in fact resonate, as has been noted in the cited experiments—

---

[9][Ed.] See Galeazzi's more extensive comments from his preface to volume 1 (*supra*) about needing a teacher in addition to books.

[10][Ed.] Galeazzi previously made this distinction in the second paragraph of the preface to vol. 1 of the *Elements*. See the Introduction to this translation, .

[11][Gal.] It is a strange theory to derive the principles of harmony from that which does not resound, and it is strange physics to make a sounding body vibrate but not resound, as if the sound itself were something other than air set into motion by those vibrations (*Dictionnaire de musique*; article: *Harmonie*).

and especially in the sixth[12]—, each of which is no less certain than the others, that prove the resonance of each overtone, i.e., the higher octave, twelfth, and major seventeenth.

I was in possession of a violin that whenever the high G of the *cantino*[13] was played with force caused the lower octave to be clearly heard, even at a considerable distance. And if two or more strong and well-tuned violins or two oboes are played nearby a harpsichord tuned with them, when the sound of the oboes or violins ceases—especially if this experiment is done in the quiet night air—one will distinctly hear the lower octave and twelfth and, a little bit more weakly, the major seventeenth. It is evident, then, that this experiment succeeds only with higher pitches and not the lower ones, since in the latter, the lower twelfth and seventeenth are too low and no longer perceptible by the ear. It is furthermore very evident that the resonating of lower harmonics must be much weaker than the higher ones, because a large string can easily make a much smaller one vibrate and resonate but not vice versa. But if the smaller one is multiplied in order to render its sound sufficiently robust, there will be no further trouble distinguishing the lower harmonics, as can be seen in the cited article. I have tarried somewhat on this subject, as it treats a very central experiment of the system that I explain here (and from which is derived the fundamental harmony of the fourth of the key) and that, at the same time, has

---

[12][Gal.] I know well what objection will be made by some to my Experiment VI. Monsieur Sauveur already demonstrated to the Academy of Sciences in Paris that if there are two strings of equal diameter and tension but of different length, so that the one is a third part of the other, if the shorter one is made to sound, the longer one will divide itself into three equal parts through two fixed points, and each of those parts will resonate in unison with the short string. In proof of this, he placed small cards of two different colors, that is, for example, red ones at the points of division between the three parts, and three white ones at half of those distances. Then, by making the short string sound, the large one was made to vibrate but in a way that the red cards remain immobile and the white ones fall away; wherefore, the string, instead of vibrating in its totality, vibrates only in its three parts. Dissenters, nevertheless, will say that my cards fall away only because they are found in the vibrating parts of the string. Without taking anything away from the merits of Monsieur Sauveur's experiments, I will say only that the actual resonating of the lower partials, and especially of the octave, which can be very distinctly heard by anyone who has taken the required precautions, is indisputable; it cannot happen without the string having total vibrations in addition to the partial vibrations. I have not yet had the time to make all of the necessary experiments on this subject that I perhaps will do in the future, and I will make them known to the public. For me, it is enough only that the fact is certain beyond doubt and has been proven a thousand times by me and by my students, and that I am certain that anyone who will want to go to the trouble of carefully replicating my experiments will succeed. [Ed.] Galeazzi may have been referring to Joseph Sauveur, *Principes d'Acoustique et de Musique, ou systême general des intervalles des sons, et de son application à tous les Instrumens de Musique* (Paris, 1701; reprint, Geneva: Minkoff, 1973), 51–58 (sec. 9, "Des sons harmoniques").

[13][Ed.] Galeazzi uses this term in volume 1 to refer to the E string of the violin.

been controversial and even denied by men who are extremely learned and very erudite.

Having established the bases of my system with incontrovertible experiments, I proceed to elucidate them in detail in the following articles (through the eighth inclusive) and to explain, with the greatest clarity possible for me, the theory of fundamental bass, upon which the science of harmony totally depends. This is not Rameau's system or Tartini's or any other author's or my own. It is everybody's because it is tacitly followed, without knowing it, by all of the most excellent practitioners.[14] I take no credit other than that of having discovered it, turned it into method, and explained it. What is it worth, in fact, to fabricate systems in one's head that are discredited at every step by experience and that must be abandoned at every step when turned into practice? Such are all of the musical theories that have previously appeared: great contrivances of calculations, geometry, and ratiocinations—but in practice, everything falls to pieces. While the philosophers limited themselves by studying Nature in their workrooms with the peripatetic method, perpetually disputing among themselves, the sciences made very little progress. But when Descartes arose, who was the first to say to them: we must question Nature herself; this is the great book that we must study and abandon the scholastic disputes once and for all[15]—then physics raised its flight to the stars and arrived little by little at the flourishing and lofty state in which we admire it today.

I have therefore sought to consult practice—the best compositions of the most classic and celebrated masters—and from these I have drawn my system, such as it is, in which a single case of harmony cannot be proposed for which it cannot render a most adequate reason. For what does it serve, in fact, to dispute whether the second degree of the key should take 6/3 or 6/4/3—even if those composers who sustain the first opinion in the scale then employ the second accompaniment in their compositions? Why say that the descending sixth of the key should be a minor sixth, when in practice everyone agrees in

---

[14][Gal.] Monsieur Rameau notes the same thing in his *Traité de l'harmonie*: "It is certainly an astonishing thing that the practice of this art should have been able to reach the point where it has arrived without understanding its foundation and that all of the rules have been specifically found without having discovered their underlying principles." [Ed.] This quotation actually comes from Rousseau, *Dictionnaire*, 43, under the entry for "basse-fondamentale." Rousseau does not actually say that the quotation comes from the *Traité*, but he does mention the *Traité* in the article, and it is easy to see how Galeazzi could have assumed it as the source of the quotation.

[15][Ed.] Here Galeazzi describes the basic premises of René Descartes' *Discours de la méthode pour bien conduire sa raison, et chercher la verité dans les sciences plus la dioptrique, les météores, et la géometrie, qui sont des essais de cette méthode* (Leiden: Ian Maire, 1637).

using the major, and other similar pointless disputes? My generation of the dissonant chord by means of coupling the semitones of the scale, as well as that of the diminished-seventh chord pertaining to minor keys, perhaps will not be pleasing to some, but what can I do about it? If Nature speaks here with the final evidence and wants a clear and definite idea of the key everywhere, this depends entirely on the abovementioned semitones, among which a most violent attraction occurs, as every practitioner will acknowledge. If, in fact, I have the semitone F E (key of C), I have no better bass to place under it than C, and if, vice versa, I have B C in the higher part, I have no better bass than F E. When I place the fundamental bass G C under it, here is the dissonant chord of 7/5/3 as clear as clear can be, without racking one's brains to deduce it from a combination of thirds, from calculation, or from more distant and scabrous principles.

Others will not wish me well in asserting that there should be two chords of 6/5/3 that are essentially different, i.e., one fundamental and the other an inversion of 7/5/3. The chord of 6/5/3 above a fundamental bass that ascends by step is the creation of Monsieur Rameau, who derives it, however, with a much more scientific contrivance and in a very different way than mine. Since it was enough for me that such a chord conform perfectly to practice, I have derived it without much bother from the very simple law of harmonic connection, which seems to me much more natural and intelligible—even more so, since from this same principle (which is my third law of fundamental bass), I also derived the fourth, in which this bass is forbidden from descending diatonically.

I have next examined and summarily elucidated in Article X the rules of counterpoint precisely as they are given by the contrapuntists. Here I have made various useful observations and exceptions. As is cautioned there, these rules, all gathered together in a bundle here, must not all be given to the student at once, but only one at a time. In this way, they will better impress themselves on the mind and will more easily establish the habit of putting them into practice.

The following four articles demonstrate the way of putting into practice the first lessons of counterpoint. What is said about them here is certainly not enough to implement them properly—the aid of a good master is wanted. But it will serve, nevertheless, to give an idea to anyone who may know nothing of the method that must be followed in this study.

The nature and the accompaniment of minor scales is explained in Article XV. Here, many new observations will be found, and it will be seen how everything may be marvelously explained and demonstrated with the customary four

laws of fundamental bass. The accompaniment that I demonstrate must be given to the descending sixth in these minor keys will not be to the liking of most masters accustomed to giving it augmented 6/3 or augmented 6/4/3, and they will raise their eyebrows at hearing that its true accompaniment must be augmented 6/5/3. Let them read my reasons herein, and then let them condemn me.

In Article XVI, I begin to develop the theory of modulations in order to explore it more thoroughly in the second section. In any case, I here give a method to set down a basso continuo properly by means of a table that will be a marvel to use, and by means of which, after a few lessons, any beginner will be able to put down a good bass, one of the most difficult tasks. This table, which is based on my theory of semitones, confirms it all the more and renders more plausible my unwavering opinion that the semitones of the scale exert the utmost influence in the science of harmony.

Article XVII, containing something even more interesting, presents the doctrine of imitations, which forms the foundation of what is called artful counterpoint, one of the main resources of the art. Using the scale and various intervals, a series of examples is given that set forth the majority of the imitations of which they are capable. This can have the most extensive use in sequences, since any sequence shorn of ornamental notes is turned into scales or regular intervals. Shorn in this manner, it will be easy to find the appropriate imitations with the assistance of the mentioned examples.

In the following two articles, the way of writing well in three and four parts is taught, and in the final three articles, the other parts of artful counterpoint are given, i.e., double counterpoint, canons, and fugues. An endless number of very curious things will be discovered about double counterpoint, a subject of greatest utility, that will serve to make better known the vastness of the science of music. The most curious canons are next deciphered and a way to make them is given, but I have elaborated most on the very important subject of the fugue, which forms the key to this science. Among other things, a table will be found here, under which I have explained the various cases that can arise in different subjects in order to give them their adequate answers, and I have devised several scales of correspondence very useful for that purpose and in which can be seen at glance how the notes of the fifth correspond to those of the fourth and vice versa. In this way, I hope to have given the clearest rules about answers, a subject that often confuses beginners. I have not spoken, however, of the way of writing answers in the plainsong modes, inasmuch as this subject does not enter into the plan of our work. Next, the way to weave a

fugue is taught, and one is proposed as an example, which if not a masterwork, will nevertheless be enough to give a sufficient idea of it to the beginner.

We next pass to the second section. I believe, to the best of my knowledge, that what is said about melody in eight articles is the first to set the scythe to a still untouched field. We have, in fact, countless authors who have written with varied success about harmony, but there is not one of them that I know who has treated the principal part of modern music, i.e., melody. I have attempted this new course, and I ask pardon from my reader if I have had to invent some new terms not yet used in music—which are those of major cadence, minor cadence, characteristic passage, etc.; regretfully, the newness of the subject has compelled me to augment musical nomenclature that is unfortunately already overabundant. For the rest, the subject is so vast and important that it would well merit a work by itself, which perhaps one day I will present to the public if these first fruits of my efforts turn out to be favorably received by them. Therefore, may the reader find pleasing those bits of information that I have sketched out here additionally, in which I have sought to include something of great interest, and may they stimulate his laudable curiosity.

In the first article, then, I treat the way of writing and of setting forth one's own ideas, which is the first exercise that must be done, even before studying counterpoint. But Article II is much more remarkable: I have done everything possible to find several easy ways to aid inspiration and imagination in one who may be slow in invention. Some will perhaps consider the ideas that I present to the public on this subject as puerile and pointless. Nevertheless, anyone who will not be prejudiced against them and who will see fit to try them out, as I myself have done many times with my students, will be in the position to judge if the means that I set forth can satisfy the yearnings of the curious. The tables of combinations, about which an essay is furnished, certainly elucidate all there is to be desired about this matter.

Of utmost importance is Article III, in which melody is analyzed, showing how many and of what periods it must be comprised. Here, it will be well for the scholar to peruse the best compositions of classical authors. Let him become accustomed to searching for and distinguishing their periods and analyzing all their parts. Then, he will know with greater facility how to craft a melody properly and how to adjust its various parts with good order and naturalness.

In Article IV, then, I have undertaken to treat modulation, about which I still believe I am the first to write anything.[16] In fact, no one can be found who has said a word about such an essential part of modern music (almost unknown, however, in past centuries), except for some small shreds that are scattered here and there in Rousseau's *Dictionnaire*. I have therefore taught the way of making any progression of keys that may be desired by the composer, based on the simple law of harmonic connection, which here again (in greater confirmation of my system) forms the basis for the art of modulating properly. I have given a synoptic table of all of the keys most in use, by means of which may be seen all of the correspondences and relationships of the various modern keys and the way to pass from one to another, even though very distant.

In the following three articles, much useful knowledge is given about the handling[17] of every composition in any style whatsoever and about the way of orchestrating effectively, and the work concludes by giving necessary insights about the practical method of forming compositions and about the nature of all of the instruments most in use in the orchestra, without which one will never be able to orchestrate effectively.

Observe how much and what knowledge may be expected from this second volume, in which I have sought to demonstrate everything with the force of ratiocination, without taking any account of the authorities, of which I would have easily be able to gather a great number. The authorities in the empirical sciences carry no weight, except when they serve to illustrate a proposition, already rigorously and plainly demonstrated by a correct and well-founded ratiocination. Without a doubt, many will find something here to

---

[16][Gal.] I hear that an excellent work by Sig. Kimberger was published in 1774 in Berlin titled *The Art of Composing Music, etc.*, which discusses the subject of progression and modulation in an excellent manner by means of some tables. But as this work is in the German tongue, which is unknown to me, I am not in a position to say more about it to my reader. [Ed.] Johann Philipp Kimberger, *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik aus sicheren Grundsätzen hergeleitet und mit deutlichen Beyspielen erläutert*, 2 vols. (Berlin and Königsberg: C. F. Voss, G. J. Decker, and G. L. Hartung, 1771–79).

[17][Ed.] Galeazzi uses *condotta* and *condurre* many times throughout the treatise. A dictionary contemporary to his time (*Dizionario della lingua italiana*, 7 vols. [Bologna: Fratelli Masi, 1819–26]) clearly conveys the sense of what he means when he later modifies the verb with *bene*: "*Condotto*, with the addition of *bene*, *perfettamente*, or similar words is said of a work of art such as painting, sculpture, etc., that is perfected and worked with diligence and mastery [Condotto, coll'aggiunto di Bene, Perfettamente, o simili, dicesi di alcun lavorio, come di pittura, scultura ec. che sia perfezionato, e lavorato con diligenza, e maestria]." Compare the obsolete usage documented by the second edition of the *Oxford Dictionary of Music*, which defines "conduct," with respect to painting, as "management of the parts of a work of art, mode of treatment, execution." We have accordingly translated *condotta* and *condurre* as "handling" or "handle" to convey this meaning more directly to modern readers.

criticize according to their will; some perhaps will remain gratified by it, and this is enough for me.

Before terminating this by now already lengthy preface, perhaps it will not be unwelcome to find here some illumination about the opinion one must hold about the science of harmony, which some exalt too highly, others deprecate too much, and usually without understanding it. The great contrapuntists usually look at modern compositions with a malevolent eye: neither can they be convinced that harmony, without melody, expresses nothing and that a series of good chords is only like a collection of beautiful words that do not make sense. But much more worthy of our examination is the common false opinion of the ignorant masses that counterpoint is inimical to that which they call good taste.[18]

Here is the type of speech that is unfortunately heard at every moment from the mouths of the ignorant and from those who speak without understanding what they say: "Music is made to delight the hearing; what do so many rules of counterpoint serve? So long as a composer entertains us and gives us pleasure, it matters not at all to us if he should make a thousand errors and write everything contrary to the rules." A reasoning more confused and incoherent than this cannot be given. The rules of counterpoint are not whimsical and fancifully invented by the masters. They are derived as necessary consequences of immutable laws that Nature offers us to delight the hearing. It can be taken as absolutely certain that wherever these rules will be fully observed, the hearing must necessarily be delighted, and whenever it should happen that the audience is bored, it will always be indisputable that the composer has only put into practice those rules of his art that precisely aspire to no end other than that of elegantly delighting the hearing.

But here a specious objection is made, which is necessary to refute. It is true, say some, that many masters—prized and of great renown and esteemed by everyone as most profound contrapuntists—weary the audience with dull and insipid compositions. The fact is undeniable, but I reply that these much-acclaimed masters possess only half the art. They are only harmonists; melodists, little or not at all. That is to say, they know only the accessory part of music, but not the principal part; therefore, they must not be considered consummate composers. In the same way, since painting consists of two essential

[18][Ed.] Galeazzi had earlier taken up this topic with similar passion at the end of the preface to the first volume of the *Elements*. See the Introduction, ❦❦, *supra*.

parts, the design and the coloring, he who possesses only one of them cannot be considered a consummate painter.[19]

Then, there are some ear-composers who venture to compose for the theater and who unfortunately sometimes win applause without knowing almost anything of counterpoint. These (in which the modern theater greatly abounds) are simple melodists, but not harmonists. Praised by the ignorant, their compositions, although they have only the most superficial merit of a melody that is usually poorly handled, make ~~an~~ impression at times on the listeners through the pointless allurement of some sweet and expressive passages. But lacking the solid support of harmony and the thread of an effectively regulated handling, they very quickly lose their merit, and the public, either sooner or later, realizes that it has been deceived and resolves to boo that same subject today that yesterday they had greatly applauded.

Therefore, it is not enough to write music of taste: it must be fortified by a robust harmony, without which taste alone will always produce a foul result. But above all, what is this good taste? Here is a question to pose to those sages who want to decide everything without any knowledge. Taste cannot be defined; it is a quality relative to each individual;[20] it is not a real, existing object. A production of the spirit that will be to the taste of one will be distasteful to another. Let us hear, for a moment, the philosopher from Geneva: "Everyone has his own particular taste which gives things that he calls beautiful and good a status that pertains only to him. One person is more moved by a sentimental piece, the other likes the lively arias better. A sweet and flexible voice will fill its songs with pleasing ornaments; a strong and substantial voice will animate its songs with the accents of passion. One will seek simplicity in melodies, the other will make great account of sophisticated features, and both will call the taste that they have selected elegant. Now such a diversity derives from the different disposition of the organs that taste teaches us to use, sometimes from the particular character of each man, which renders it more sensible

[19][Ed.] Compare the analogy between music and painting made in one of Galeazzi's sources, Giovanni Battista Martini's *Esemplare o sia saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto sopra il canto fermo*, 2 vols. (Bologna: Lelio dalla Volpe, 1774), 1:xiii, in which Martini likens the design in painting to counterpoint and its coloring to idea or invention in music.

[20][Ed.] The position of Galeazzi and Rousseau that taste was an individual matter was promulgated earlier in the eighteenth century by the prominent Italian philosopher Ludovico Antonio Muratori in his *Delle riflessioni sopra il buon gusto nelle scienze e nelle arti*, 2 vols. (Venice: Nicolò Pezzana, 1717). It is not known if Galeazzi was familiar with this work. Vincenzo Manfredini's *Regole armoniche*, however, a source with which Galeazzi was familiar, offers an example of the opposing point of view in the eighteenth-century debate over taste: taste, like truth, was absolute and not relative to nationality or individual preference. See Vincenzo Manfredini,

to a pleasure or a vice than to another, sometimes from the diversity of age and gender, which turns the desires toward different objects. In all these different cases, as each has only his own taste to oppose that of another, it is evident that it is not possible to dispute taste." (*Dictionnaire de musique*, article "Goût").[21]

If the phrase "music of taste" is void of meaning and inadmissible—except from the mouths of the proud and ignorant—what will be the true taste to be followed by a composer who aspires to the probability of winning the applause of the public? Here it is: but shamefully, very few know how to practice it. Whoever knows how to unite an elegant and expressive melody, adapted to the situation and handled according to the good rules of art, with a robust harmony according to the exact rules of counterpoint will safely be able to encounter the public with confidence, both the learned as well as the ignorant, no matter what some fools may adduce to the contrary. It is necessary, therefore, not to let oneself be bothered by the criticism that comes from the mouths of the invidious or from one who does not understand the subject that he wants to criticize: even the leading composers of the century had their opponents. Many times I have heard with my own ears the stupendous compositions of Haydn, Paisiello, Cimarosa, etc., vilified and despised. But what then? Does this perhaps take away a jot from the illustrious merit of these inimitable talents? Let the great Euler be heard,[22] and with his guidance, let

---

Regole armoniche (Venice: Guglielmo Zerletti, 1775; reprint in Monuments of Music and Music Literature in Facsimile, II/10, New York: Broude Bros., 1966), 21. For several recent studies that examine the eighteenth-century ideologies of taste, see Heinrich Besseler, "Das Wesen der Musik in heutiger Sicht," in *Festschrift für Walter Wiora zum 30. Dezember 1966*, ed. Ludwig Finscher and Christoph-Hellmut Mahling (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1967), 27–30; Belinda Cannone, "La musique et le definition du goût dans l'opinion française des Lumières," in *Itinéraires mozartiens en Bourgogne: Colloque de Dijon des 11 et 12 avril 1991*, ed. Francis Claudon (Paris: Klincksieck, 1992), 113–20; and Heinz-Dieter Meyer, "Taste Formation in Pluralistic Societies: The Role of Rhetorics and Institutions," *International Sociology* 15 (2000): 33–56.

[21] [Ed.] Rousseau, *Dictionnaire*, 235.

[22] [Gal.] But it behooves the musician to conduct himself like the architect, who cares not for the perverse judgment of the masses on buildings but constructs them according to certain and fundamental laws in nature herself, which, even though they do not please those ignorant of these laws, nevertheless is content so long as they succeed for the intelligentsia. For as in music, so also in architecture there is such diverse taste among diverse peoples that what is pleasing to some is rejected by others. On this, as on all other things, so also in music, it behooves the musician to follow above all those whose taste is perfect and whose judgment on things perceived by the senses is free from every defect. Such are those who not only received from nature an acute and pure sense of hearing but also exactly perceive all that is represented in the auditory organ and, comparing these things among themselves, apply an integral judgment to them. Euler, *Tentamen nova theorice musicæ*, Chapter II, § 1. [Ed.] Leonhard Euler, *Tentamen novae theoriae musicae ex certissimis harmoniae principiis dilucide expositae* (St. Petersburg: Academia Scientiae, 1739); the proper citation is chapter 2, §4 (pp. 27–28).

these snobs be scorned, attending only to the observance of the precepts of art, on which the entire success of every good musical composition surely depends.

But so as not to hold my reader at bay any longer, I will restrict myself to asking him to consult the paragraphs that are cited from time to time and to be willing to pardon me if at times I have had to repeat things that were already said, which I have done only for greater clarity where I have recognized the need for it in order to render my work within the grasp of everyone. Moreover, in the very many examples that adorn this volume, I have made myself a law to reproduce only my own examples, as I have already done in the first volume, and this for the intent of not doing injury to any among the immense throng of excellent compositions that so many distinguished authors have furnished for us. May heaven grant that my work may serve to instruct in part the throng of the ignorant, who oppress the profession of music and cause much harm to true and learned professors.